

19
1 32. (Once Amended) The method of claim 18 wherein the step of determining
2 includes examining a receipt date corresponding to the e-mail and a last synchronization
3 signature which indicates the last date of synchronization with the central mail store.

17
1 33. (Once Amended) The method of claim 14,
2 wherein the [second] central mail store is protected by a firewall; and
3 further comprising the step of communicating through the firewall.

21
1 34. (Once Amended) The ~~system~~^{method} of claim 13 wherein the [second] central mail store
2 is remotely located and the step of sending includes communicating [the] e-mail through
3 a computer network.

22
1 35. (Once Amended) The ~~system~~^{method} of claim 13 further comprising a synchronization-
2 start module for using a start criterion to determine when to initiate synchronization with
3 the central mail store.

32
1 36. (Once Amended) A client system for automatically downloading e-mails for a
2 particular client from a mail server which implements a particular protocol, comprising:
3 means for automatically initiating a communications channel with a mail server;
4 means for identifying the particular protocol used by the mail server; and
5 means[, coupled to the means for identifying,] for using the particular protocol to
6 download e-mails addressed to a particular client from the mail server[;
7 means, coupled to the means for using, for downloading e-mails addressed to the
8 particular client].

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 were examined and rejected in this case. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11,
13-15, 17, 18, 20-26, 28, 31-36 are being amended. Claims 3, 16 and 27 are being

canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4-15, 17-26 and 28-37 are currently pending. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Applicants request the Examiner to enter the above amendment to the Specification. No new matter is being added.

In paragraph 16, the Examiner indicated that the title was insufficiently descriptive. Applicants are amending the title to indicate more clearly the invention to which the claims are directed.

In paragraphs 17-19, the Examiner rejected claim 1-37 under 35 USC § 102 as anticipated by Brunson and elements inherent to an internet. Brunson is directed to a system for using text-to-speech or speech-to-text to synchronize an e-mail server with a voice mail server. Claim 1 as amended recites a “client” system which includes “means for obtaining e-mail from a mail server” and “means for... determining whether to forward e-mail to a central mail store.” Accordingly, the system as claimed synchronizes e-mails on the client regardless of the origin of the e-mails. Brunson does not anticipate synchronizing a *client* system. Brunson does not anticipate *determining* whether to send e-mail to a central mail store. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 as amended is novel and non-obvious over Brunson. Similarly, for at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claims 2, 4-15, 17-26 and 28-35 are also novel and non-obvious over Brunson.

Claim 36 is directed at a system which includes “means for automatically initiating a communications channel with a mail server; means for identifying the particular protocol used by the mail server; and means for using the particular protocol to download e-mails addressed to a particular client from the mail server.” Brunson does not anticipate a system that automatically initiates a communications channel between a mail server and a client. Brunson does not anticipate a system that identifies the communications protocol used by the mail server. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 36 is novel and non-obvious over Brunson. As a claim dependent therefrom, Applicants submit that claim 37 is also novel and non-obvious over Brunson.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-15, 17-26 and 28-37 under 35 USC § 102 be withdrawn.


If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-3392.

If for any reason an insufficient fee has been paid, the Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the insufficiency to Deposit Account No. 05-0150.

Dated: 3/24/99

Graham & James LLP
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
650-856-6500

Respectfully Submitted,
Mendez, Riggins, Wagle and Ying

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M A Sockol', written over a horizontal line.

Marc A. Sockol
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,823